



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

CK

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/599,890	06/21/2000	Milind Rajopadhye	DM-6999-A	7176
46339	7590	05/19/2005	EXAMINER	
BRISTOL - MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY			BALASUBRAMANIAN, VENKATARAMAN	
PO BOX 4000			ART UNIT	
PRINCETON, NJ 08543-4000			PAPER NUMBER	

1624

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/599,890

Applicant(s)

RAJOPADHYE ET AL

Examiner

Venkataraman Balasubramanian

Art Unit

1624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 February 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 76-110 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 76-110 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

S.O.O.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election of Group V of first restriction in the reply filed on 2/11/2005 is acknowledged. Applicants have cancelled claims 1-75 and presented a new set claims 76-110. Applicants have also pointed out that the second restriction should be applied only claim 47 not the rest of pending claims. This error is inadvertent omission of formula Ia and Ib after indazole nonpetide

Hence a revised restriction requirement with the new claims is made below :

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 76-110, drawn to diagnostic and therapeutic composition comprising a metal, chelator and a targeting moiety namely indazole nonpetide Ia or Ib wherein the X^{1d} , X^{2d} , X^{3d} and X^{4d} are all carbon, classified in class 424 subclass 9.4, 9.5, 9.51 etc.
- II. Claims 76-87., 91-93, 96, 100-110 drawn to diagnostic and therapeutic composition comprising a metal, chelator and a targeting moiety namely indazole nonpetide Ia or Ib wherein the X^{1d} , X^{2d} , X^{3d} and X^{4d} are independently carbon or nitrogen such that all X^{1d} , X^{2d} , X^{3d} and X^{4d} are not all carbon classified in class 424 and others subclass various depending upon the choice of the X^{1d} , X^{2d} , X^{3d} and X^{4d} .

Art Unit: 1624

If Group II is elected, applicants should also elect a specific targeting moiety i. e a suitable combination of the choice of the X^{1d} , X^{2d} , X^{3d} and X^{4d} not provided for in the Group I.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Invention I and II are independent and distinct from each other because they are directed to structurally dissimilar compounds that lack common targeting core moiety namely Indazole versus various indazole with variously substituted with nitrogen in the six membered phenyl ring. Consequently, the groups have different classifications and require separate prior art searches. They can be made and used independently. Art, which may render obvious or anticipate one of the groups would not necessarily do the same for the other group. Each can support a patent, as the compounds of each group are capable of being utilized alone not in combination with other members listed in the Markush group.

In addition, it is necessary to classify and search all the hetero cores and such a search of all core s would serious search burden given the limited time available for each application.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: See claims 88-89 Indazole and Azaindazoles with varying number of nitrogen in the phenyl ring.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, 76-87 and 90-110 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Art Unit: 1624

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Applicants should note that the previously examiner had examined only the elected indazole core wherein X^{1d} , X^{2d} , X^{3d} , X^{4d} were all carbon and the application was in condition for allowance except for a) claim 47 showed up with label as cancelled and previous amendment reinstated X^{1d} , X^{2d} , X^{3d} , X^{4d} as both nitrogen and carbon independently. Examiner's effort to rectify these two problems were not successful as Wendy Choi was not available. Barring finding of any additional prior art, the Group I should be in condition for allowance if limited to the elected indazole core wherein X^{1d} , X^{2d} , X^{3d} , X^{4d} are all carbon. Incorporation of formula Ia and Ib in independent claim 76 and 101 and limiting X^{1d} , X^{2d} , X^{3d} , X^{4d} to all carbon is suggested upon election of Group I.

In view of the distinct nature of the invention for reasons stated above, the restriction is set forth in writing to permit applicants to review

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be addressed to Venkataraman Balasubramanian (Bala) whose telephone number is (571) 272-0662. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8.00 AM to 6.00 PM. The Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) of the art unit 1624 is

Art Unit: 1624

Mukund Shah whose telephone number is (571) 272-0674. If Applicants are unable to reach Mukund Shah within 24-hour period, they may contact James O. Wilson, Acting-SPE of art unit 1624 at 571-272-0661.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned (703) 872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAG. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-2 17-9197 (toll-free).

Venkataraman Balasubramanian
Venkataraman Balasubramanian

5/15/2005